

PA
810
.D35
2000

LEXICAL EVOLUTION & LINGUISTIC HAZARD

by

FREDERICK WILLIAM DANKER

Presented at the

MEETING OF THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

Boston, Massachusetts

November 21, 1999

AN INTRODUCTION TO

A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, third edition (BDAG), edited by Frederick William Danker, based on Walter Bauer's *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*, sixth edition, ed. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, with Viktor Reichmann and on previous English editions by W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker

(CHICAGO: THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, 2000)

© FREDERICK WILLIAM DANKER, 1999

LEXICAL EVOLUTION AND LINGUISTIC HAZARD

Frederick W. Danker

Changes in language are such that bilingual dictionaries cannot lay claim to permanence. Their very genre is subject to an inexorable evolutionary process. Changing patterns in receptor languages, as well as the appearance of new data, require constant revision of dictionaries or lexicons devoted especially to biblical Hebrew and Greek. The hazards connected with such enterprise are many, as becomes readily apparent in this paper. After engagement for over forty years in the business of courting linguistic hazard, I also offer this essay as a tribute to Walter Bauer's (1877-1960) conscientious devotion to lexicographic responsibility, and above all to his stimulation for further exploration.

The immediate precursor of what can be called the Bauer lexicographic tradition was the publication of Erwin Preuschen's *Volständiges Griechisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1910). This book contained 1178 columns with 3 pages of additions and corrections. Upon Preuschen's death in 1920, Walter Bauer was asked to update Preuschen's work. He had been Privatdozent in Marburg (1902-13), professor in Breslau from 1913 to 1916, and had completed four years as professor at Göttingen. During those years he had authored *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* (Tübingen; Mohr, 1909) and a commentary on John (1st ed. 1912) in the series "Handbuch zum Neuen Testament," followed by a commentary on Ignatius in the same series (1923).

In the foreword to his revision of Preuschen's lexicon (1928) Bauer gave Mosaic expression to his misgivings on undertaking the project, stating that neither the previous course of his studies nor the direction of his scholarly work, nor even his inclination led him toward lexicography."¹

1. Walter Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1928) iii.

But Preuschen's work was in dire need of revision, if it were to meet the need of an advanced reference work rather than serve as an intermediate resource. "Chiefly," according to Felix W. Gingrich, of Albright College, Reading, Pennsylvania, who summarized prevailing judgment, "it failed to show the place which the earliest Christian writings held in the on-going stream of Greek literature as a whole."² Even the LXX was used sparingly in illustration of NT usage. Also lacking were references to modern discussions. References to papyri, inscriptions, and ostraca were lacking, despite the fact that they were published in great numbers since 1890. To some extent Preuschen shared the extraordinary imperviousness to new discoveries displayed by other colleagues in the interpreter's craft. Adolf Deissmann characterized his book as "ein . . . tief bedauerlicher Rückschritt" (a very unfortunate step backward).³ Preuschen took a defensive position and in the epilog to his work sighed that the time was not ripe for evaluation of the new material, and that taking sail on the vast sea of the Koine was too hazardous for him. Yet, while producing a stop-gap work, Preuschen did move in two new directions: he included words found in the apostolic fathers and other very early Christian literature, thereby expanding the base for understanding early Christian noetic history. Second, his is the first NT dictionary above elementary level to offer meanings in German instead of Latin.

In his watershed publication *Licht vom Osten*, Deissmann included a chapter on the future of lexicography.⁴ Bauer had evidently taken every word to heart, for the title page of the revision (1928) read: "völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage." This alteration in title resulted from a sour circumstance that turned sweet. The dive taken by German currency after World War I also left publication prospects dim, so Bauer used the extra time to expand his revision far beyond earlier assigned horizons. It was no longer a Handwörterbuch. The number of columns, two per page, increased to

2. Felix W. Gingrich, "The Contributions of Professor Walter Bauer to New Testament Lexicography," *New Testament Studies* 9 (1962), 3-10, see p. 3 (hereafter Gingrich, NTS). In fairness to Preuschen it must be noted that he expressly eschewed such an aim, declaring that he had no intention to produce a thesaurus of NT Greek.

3. Adolf Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 4th ed. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1923) 347, n. 5; cp. his observations on the elitist thinking of certain philologists and theologians, followed by a surge of change, pp. 48-49.

4. *Licht vom Osten* 341-48.

1434, with a great deal more on each page. Each headword is followed, where pertinent, by a display of usage, showing how widely the word was used in pre- and post-NT Greek. Individual words and phrases are illustrated by parallels drawn from various periods in the history of the Greek language, with special reference to the Koine and the LXX. Additions to secondary literature in English and other languages made the work more accessible to readers outside Germany. Much reorganization of Preuschen's material took place throughout the work, which also contained a preface on the nature of the NT vocabulary. Deissmann's reaction to this work: "eine im allgemeinen ganz ausgezeichnete Arbeit" (in every way a very distinguished work).⁵

In the "Vorwort" Bauer apologetically noted that several more editions would be required for the work to reach its full potential of usefulness. Restlessly productive, in 1937 he brought out a third edition, "völlig neu bearbeitet." Signaling a new stage in the evolution of his lexicon, the publishers moved from Gothic to Roman type, and a new system of abbreviations was adopted (for example, Xenophon became simply "X."). The number of columns now totaled 1490, and the title-page bore only Bauer's name. Numerous errors were corrected.⁶ Some reorganization was undertaken (e.g. $\beta\alpha\rho\upsilon\varsigma$ under two main heads instead of four). The chief deficiency, lamented by many, was the space-saving omission of his informative introduction.

Even before the third edition came off the press Bauer set himself the task of reading systematically every Greek author he could lay his hands on, with focus on the period from the fourth century BC to Byzantine times. The increased inventory of parallels in words and constructions was immense. He completed the manuscript about September 1948. The first three fascicles came out within three months in 1949, but after a delay of two years, the last fascicle of the 4th edition came out in the autumn of 1952.⁷

Bauer's investigation of Greek literature anticipated much current interest in the cultural context of New Testament usage. It covered a broad range of subjects from religion, medicine (both human and veterinary),

5. Cited in Gingrich, NTS p. 4.

6. Gingrich, NTS p. 5.

7. Gingrich, NTS p. 6.

military tactics, agriculture, and romance, with frequent account taken of Byzantine novels.⁸ His achievement is all the more astonishing when one takes note of the circumstances under which he labored. After World War II, American biblical scholars were asked to help out their German biblical colleagues. Prof. Gingrich selected Bauer and sent him food packages from 1947 to the early 1950s. Gingrich visited Bauer in 1950, and Mrs. Bauer told him that the packages he sent saved their lives. But malnutrition during the closing months of the war caused an eye infection which led to impairment of Bauer's eyes, so that he had to read with the aid of a magnifying glass. Yet, seven years later, on his eightieth birthday, he was at work completing the fifth edition of his lexicon.

The only unabridged Greek-English lexicon of the NT up to 1957 was *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti*, translated and revised by Joseph H. Thayer (New York: Harper, 1886; corrected ed. 1889). The title indicates that the basic underlying text is C. L. W. Grimm's thorough revision⁹ of C. G. Wilke's Greek-Latin lexicon.¹⁰ Thayer's work had served American scholars well, absent papyri, which were to draw attention soon after the discovery in 1897 of Roman office records in the sands of ancient Oxyrhynchus. Bauer's work dealt with this deficiency and more. Hence there was no question concerning the direction that lexicographic evolution would take in America.

BAG

While Bauer was laboring on his 4th edition, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod formed a committee for scholarly research under the direction of Martin Scharlemann, a professor at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri. Its principal project was to be the translation and adaptation of Bauer's lexicon. Translation rights were duly obtained, and Prof. Gingrich was given a full-time leave of absence by Albright Col-

8. For statistics on inclusion of new authors and writings relative to Bauer's earlier editions, see Gingrich, NTS p. 6.

9. Ludwig Wilibald Grimm, *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in libros Novi Testamenti* (Leipzig, 1862). Grimm's work was the first to include variant readings.

10. Christian Gottlob Wilke, *Clavis Novi Testamenti philologica* (Dresden and Leipzig, 1839; 2 vols. 1851).

lege to work on the project, beginning in September 1949. Prof. William F. Arndt, of Concordia Seminary, was asked to head the project. He joined his colleague for several days each week at Chicago, where they profited from the advice of Dr. Mitford D. Mathews, head of the dictionary department at the University of Chicago Press.¹¹

In the course of the American team's work, it became necessary to determine the most advantageous locale for printing of the book. As reported by Gingrich,¹² the typesetting was particularly challenging because it involved two main kinds of Greek type as well as several others for an occasional Hebrew word or phrase, roman and italic type for English, and special characters for Scandinavian and other languages. Finally the contract was awarded to the Cambridge University Press in England. Funds for work on the manuscript were provided by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, which would share the costs of printing, as well as proceeds from the sale of the book, with the University of Chicago Press and the Cambridge University Press. Not only did Cambridge print the work, but it agreed to publish it simultaneously with its publication in the United States. Hence the earliest edition of *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (generally known as BAG) appeared in 1957 in duplicate, one published in England, on January 25, and one in Chicago, on January 29. The book contained 909 pages of text and 37 pages of preliminary matter. Price: \$14.00, courtesy of generous subsidy by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. The University of Chicago Press heads, who, as Dr. Mathews said years later, did not have their fingers on the American ancient Greek and biblical pulse, set a figure of 2000 copies for the first printing. But before the manuscript was finished it was evident that the demand would be heavier than estimated, and so the run was raised to 4000 copies, with 1500 more at Cambridge. The first printing was sold out in about four months, and by October 15, 7500 copies

11. For details on the publication of BAG see Felix W. Gingrich, "A Lexicographer at Work," *Papers of the Athenaeum Club for 1957* (Athenaeum Club of Reading, Pennsylvania, 1958) 39-44 (hereafter Gingrich, *Papers*). M. D. Mathews is especially noted for his *A Dictionary of Americanisms on Historical Principles*, 2 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951).

12. For many of the details on the publishing fortunes of BAG, see Gingrich, *Papers*, 39-44.

had gone into the hands of eager buyers, for nearly 100 theological seminaries adopted the book for classroom use.

BAG was produced on 22,400 slips of paper, 4 x 6 inches. On the fortunes of the manuscript, Gingrich writes: "No serious accident ever befell our manuscript. As we finished our slips, we kept them on a bookcase in the office, where they were subject to destruction by fire if one of the smokers in the adjoining office had been careless. Fortunately this never happened."¹³ The team also faced a special problem in transmitting their thousands of slips. They had to have them photographed by a Remington Rand machine. Faring far better than some biblical writers whose productions are alleged to have come down to posterity in scrambled form, Arndt and Gingrich did not go through the trauma of seeing a tray dropped in the course of feeding the slips into the copy machine. At his home in Reading, Gingrich received bundles of proof from England, then dispatched them to Arndt, who read them and sent them on to Chicago, whence they were returned to Cambridge. Not one package of proof went astray. The only mishap that befell the team was some documents which were inadvertently sent for safe-keeping, early in 1952, to Davy Jones's locker, via Captain Heinrik Carlsen's ill-starred ship, *Flying Enterprise*.

The typesetters at Cambridge estimated that if all the letters in the book were arranged in one line, it would be 84 miles long (or .093 miles per page). Gingrich reports that "one poor man did nothing but set type on our dictionary for eight months straight, and retained his sanity." Moreover, he writes, these printers "followed copy in spelling according to the American system rather than their own British system. For example, we always spelled 'labor' without the 'u' that is so dear to the British, and they never raised an objection."¹⁴ As indicated above, Bauer's introduction to the second edition of Preuschen's work included an essay on the nature of NT Greek. This was omitted in all subsequent German editions. Upon repeated urging Bauer prepared a revised version of his essay, which was published separately,¹⁵ and Arndt and Gingrich added to BAG a slightly edited translation of this marvelously rich treatise, courtesy of Bauer.

13. Gingrich, *Papers*, 41.

14. Gingrich, *Papers*, 41.

15. Walter Bauer, "Zur Einführung in das Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament," *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* XV (Lund and Copenhagen: Gleerup and Munksgaard, 1955).

During work on the book, neither Arndt nor Gingrich suffered any serious accident or illness. But, during a stay in England, Arndt died suddenly of a heart attack in Cambridge, February 25, 1957, exactly one month after the publication of the book in the same city. "He was an excellent scholar," writes Gingrich, "and one who was thoroughly saturated with the spirit of the New Testament. I miss him greatly."

BAGD

Shortly after the publication of BAG, my own life took an unexpected turn. During my studies at Concordia Seminary (1940-45), I did not dream of doing lexicography. But without my awareness a specific route to the future was being paved for me. When I undertook my doctoral studies, with special interest in Homer, Pindar, and the Greek tragedians, at the University of Chicago, Department of Humanities, I was intrigued by the way L-S-J-M¹⁶ defined and classified words. But literary structures interested me more. Having been mesmerized by the Hebrew text of Koheleth, I satisfied seminary requirements for a B.D. with a dissertation in which I endeavored to show that this essay is a literary piece in its own right, with focus on the thematic word *hebel*, expressing "disappointment of expectation." I also filled an interleaved Greek NT with references to Greek literature culled in the course of reading the thousands of pages required for partial access to the Ph.D. at the University of Chicago.

While serving as pastor in various parishes during 1945-54, at the request of Dr. Arndt I worked through Josephus and numerous other authors, still unaware that I would ever do lexical work, for one of my ambitions was to teach some of Arndt's courses, especially Luke, at Concordia Seminary. In 1954 I was called to serve as associate professor in New Testament, and in 1957, a few weeks after Arndt's death, colleague Scharlemann asked whether I would work with Dr. Gingrich on a new edition of BAG. Like Bauer, he and Gingrich were well aware that obsolescence is the immediate destiny of anything outside the Iliad or the Bible and related works that have enriched humanity. Gingrich opted to translate all of Bauer's additions, and I volunteered to update the secondary lit-

16. L-S-J-M, the acronym for (H. G.) Liddell, (R.) Scott, (H. S.) Jones, (R.) McKenzie, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-40). Frequently written "LSJ," but with unawareness of the fact that McKenzie made major contributions.

erature, recheck numerous references, modify renderings as needed, and include more parallels to ancient literature. Our busy schedules and slim budgets somehow limited us to two personal meetings over the course of 22 years. We shared all our work by mail. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, donated 2000 sheets of printing paper, 15" x 17", on which the pages taken from four copies of BAG were mounted. While Gingrich entered his translation, I glossed the text and sent my work to Gingrich in batches. Gingrich, in turn, entered my work on his master copy and returned my sheets with queries or with dismissal of an interpretation. Sometimes debate continued for several mailings, interlaced with linguistic horse trading and delightful banter. It was an experience of unforgettable collegiality. Some exchanges included determined defense of a viewpoint, and in one instance I glossed my insistence with the line "bloody but unbowed." "OK, Henley," Gingrich glossed on the return mailing. In effect we had our own postal chatroom, prompting Gingrich, to write at one point, "We ought to publish some of our marginal notations." Thanks to the efficiency of the United States Postal Service we never lost a page, and our work was eventually published in 1979, becoming known as BAGD.¹⁷ I thought that this would be the end of such labor for me, but upon the Alands' publication of Bauer's sixth edition,¹⁸ Penelope Kaiserlian, associate director of the University of Chicago Press, asked me to check whether a new edition of BAGD was necessary. Since I was about to retire and had some other kinds of books in mind, I was reluctant to consider the task, but she requested that I take a second look at the German edition. I told her that the German work exhibited no new developments of a challenging philological nature, but did make use of numerous intertestamental books and other early texts relating to New Testament themes

17. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A translation and adaptation of the fourth revised and augmented edition of Walter Bauer's "Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur," by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, second edition revised and augmented by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker from Walter Bauer's fifth edition, 1958* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press: 1979).

18. *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur von Walter Bauer: 6., völlig neu bearbeitete, Auflage im Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung/Münster unter besonderer Mitwirkung von Viktor Reichmann, ed. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988). The main body of the book consists of 1796 columns, with glosses and NT references in bold-face type.

and diction either not included by Bauer, or at least not extensively. I therefore agreed to undertake the editing of a new edition, which was to be done within 5 years, on the assumption that the principal work would consist in adding to BAGD the Alands' new material.

BDAG

As the inevitability of lexicographical evolution began to make itself felt, it became apparent that the revision project would consume far more time. For example, Bauer and the American editors had used for the apostolic fathers an edition by O. Gebhardt, A. Harnack, and T. Zahn,¹⁹ which was superseded by K. Bihlmeyer's revision.²⁰ The specific text of the Shepherd of Hermas in the G.-H.-Z. collection had been superseded by M. Whittaker's edition.²¹ This meant, of course, that all references to the apostolic fathers had to be rechecked and reevaluated, a task made additionally burdensome by the Alands' use only of Whittaker's division markers. Fortunately Whittaker had not scuttled the traditional mode of reference, which I maintained throughout, thus ensuring that students acquainted with the text divisions found in traditional forms of the text would have ready access to a specific segment of text in the apostolic fathers. A major source of difficulty was the idiosyncratic referencing of inscriptions and papyri. Frequent obscurity in citation of such documents in Bauer's editions is traceable to the lack of a standard for identification of these works. I hope that I have contributed to the standardization process. Except for a few variations, the abbreviations or acronyms for papyri follow the list in the ASP check list.²² For inscriptions I have largely followed the lead of G. H. R. Horsley.²³ Numerous

19. O. Gebhardt, A. Harnack, and T. Zahn, eds., *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1920).

20. K. Bihlmeyer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 2d ed. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1956).

21. M. Whittaker, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, I: *Der Hirt des Hermas* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956). Also noted in BDAG are M. Leutzsch, "Hirt des Hermas" in *Papias Fragmente; Hirt des Hermas* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998) and R. Joly, *Hermas, Le Pasteur* (Sources Chrétiennes 53) 2d. ed. rev. and augmented (Paris: Cerf, 1968). See also C. Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, series Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999).

22. *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets* (Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrology, Supplement 7) 4th ed., 1992.

23. G. H. R. Horsley and J. A. L. Lee, "A Preliminary Checklist of Abbreviations of Greek Epigraphic Volumes," *Epigraphica* 46 (1994) 129-69.

deviations in BDAG from either the Alands' or Bauer's referencing of lineations in inscription or papyri are the result of rechecking the corpora. To many of the British Museum Inscriptions (IBM), some of which a few of our earlier readers found difficult to locate, I have added volume and page. In the case of the PGM papyri and numerous other writings, I followed the principle that limits should be set for sending neophytes on a chase. Notorious in Bauer's and the Alands' text are the many instances in which knowledge of the work of an author off the beaten track of Greek literature is assumed and little or no detail provided. This is particularly true of Byzantine authors. Without impugning specialists' competence, the composite list (no. 8) of abbreviations in the new edition is partially designed to dilute some of the obscurity, on the theory that one ought not expect an undergraduate to decipher, for example, "μαρτύριον τῆς ἁγίας Αἰκατερίνας 18 p. 17 Viteau," as given in BAAR at ἐκβάλλω.

Although the revision of Preuschen's work marked an advance on that particular work, it is important to recognize that Bauer remained in the mainstream of a long Teutonic lexical tradition, beginning with the first dictionary limited to the Greek New Testament, produced by Eilhard Lubin in 1614.²⁴ In contrast to this and other pioneering efforts, Georg Pasor's lexicon (1619) wins laurels as the first New Testament lexicon of scientific pretensions.²⁵ Subsequent NT lexicons put under contribution by Bauer are cited in his revision of Preuschen's lexicon. Besides the third edition (1886) of Wilke-Grimm, *Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica*, he used Thayer, and works by Cremer,²⁶ Zorell,²⁷ Ebeling,²⁸ Moulton-

24. Eilhard Lubin, *Clavis Novi Testamenti seu breve omnium dictionum, quibus conscriptum est lexicon* (Rostock, 1614).

25. G. Pasor, *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in Novum domini nostri Jesus Christi Testamentum* (Herborn, in Nassau, 1619). For a facsimile of the title page, see Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 346. See also Heinrich Schlosser, in *Neutestamentliche Studien; Georg Heinrici zu seinem 70. Geburtstag* (Leipzig, 1914) 253. Not without importance in view of Bauer's emphasis on the LXX in New Testament study is Pasor's grammatical work, *Grammatica Graeca Sacra Novi Testamenti nostri Jesu Christi* (Amsterdam, 1655), a book that went through more than thirty printings until its last edition in 1774. A strict alphabetical order appeared for the first time in *Dictionarium Novi Testamenti*, published at Basel in 1640 by Ludovicus Lucius.

26. H. Cremer, *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräzität* (Gotha, 1866), 11th rev. ed. J. Kögel (Gotha, 1923).

27. F. Zorell, *Lexicon Graecum Novi Testamenti* (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1904; 3d ed. 1961).

28. H. Ebeling, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Hannover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1913).

Milligan,²⁹ and Preisigke.³⁰ In addition, Bauer derived numerous references from dissertations, philological monographs, lexicons of ancient authors, and indexes in publications of Greek literary and documentary texts, to cite but a few of the sources. From Bauer's 5th edition one can determine the enormous volume of additional resources that taxed his mind and body since his revision of Preuschen's lexicon. What would be the next stage in NT lexical modification?

After accepting the assignment for a third American edition of Bauer, I began to enter BAAR's new material into an electronic copy of BAGD. While doing this on an Apple Computer, I secured copies of all non-NT texts that formed the lexical base in BAAR, as well as the principal secondary philological sources used by Bauer, especially dissertations, not to speak of attempting to keep abreast of some current developments. Those who helped share the burdens in this enterprise receive acknowledgment in the foreword of BDAG.³¹

The 26th edition of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece* (1979, with numerous reprintings), served as the primary data base for BAAR. Therefore I used it, as well as the 27th edition (1993), whose text reproduced that of the 26th, but with substantial revision of the critical apparatus. In keeping with Bauer's principles, BDAG has added to the store of variant readings. The initial paragraph in BDAG Abbreviation List 1 notes the principal Greek NT editions. Some words appear in the apparatus of various editions but do not form part of the vocabulary used in the main text. To meet the demand of students for interpretation also of such words, BDAG enters them as headwords.

29. J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914ff.).

30. F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw. aus Ägypten*, ed. E. Kiessling, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1925-31).

31. In addition to the detailed examination of BAAR by R. Borger, "Zum Stande der neutestamentlichen Lexicographie: Die Neubearbeitung des Wörterbuchs von W. Bauer," *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 241 (1989) 103-46, three reviews of Bauer/BAG/BAGD deserve special mention: H. Braunert, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 68 (1957) 357-62 and 69 (1958) 138-41; D. J. Georgakas, *Classical Philology* 76 (1958) 153-59, many of whose observations have been honored in BDAG, except his concerns about presenting uncontracted verbs as entries; and P. Katz (W. P. M. Walters) in *Kratos* 5 (1960) 157-63. Also, review of BAAR: M. Reiser, *Theologische Quartalschrift* 169 (1989) 141-43; F. Neirynck, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 64 (1988) 450-54.

Theoretically, conjectures and transcribed errors have no place in a specialized dictionary, but the fact that they do appear in critical editions and reconstruction of ancient texts suggests that users of our lexicon might well appreciate definitions as well as explanations for their suspect status. Exceptions include BAAR's lemmatizing of δῖγνωμος and φθίνω.³² POxyrhynchus 1081 requires special alertness. For example, BAAR includes the word νύκη, a term extant in non-biblical literature, but incorrectly restored by the original editor. Since it appears in BAAR and has received other endorsement I have included it in BDAG with a warning label. Similarly, the word πέραν is attributed in BAAR to POxy. 1081, where it is really to be read as part of the word ἀπέραντος. Under the headword εἰδέα, BAAR cites Mt. 28:3, but with the notation that the form εἰδέα is a transcription error, followed by a directive to ἰδέα. Thereby BAAR is in conflict with N27, which reads εἰδέα. BDAG includes the information that N25 notes a preference for ἰδέα. This state of affairs serves also as a reminder that older editions are not to be hurled into the scholar's remainder bin.

In previous editions specific manuscripts were cited for many variant readings. In this edition I principally use the symbol "v. l.," and except for manuscript D, which is cited frequently, only occasional reference is made to other textual witnesses. This procedure became all the more necessary in view of the peculiar listing of witnesses in BAAR, where the symbol "Hss" ("Handschriften") applies to manuscripts in general, and "t. r." to the "textus-receptus" tradition. In practice these two symbols comprise Byzantine and related manuscript tradition. As a rule of thumb, if a variant in BDAG cannot be found in the apparatus of any Nestle edition,³³ it will generally be available in the two-volume edition

32. δῖγνωμος is not a v. l. but a late gloss in mss. 056 and 0142. φθίνω results from a mistaken restoration of POxy. 1081, 6.

33. BAAR's use of "v. l." applies to readings in the 26th edition of Nestle. Editions of Nestle earlier than the 26th are useful in clarifying textual problems. For example, under διαδιδωμι BDAG cites J 6:11 and notes the v.l. ἔδωκεν cited in the apparatus of N25. The careful reader will observe that N25 cites P66 as one of the witnesses for ἔδωκεν, and that N27, while succeeding in rectifying N26, inadvertently retains the latter's error in the notation of διέδωκεν. See R. Borger, "NA26 und die neutestamentliche Textkritik," *Theologische Rundschau* 52 (1987)1-58, esp. 34-35 (hereafter cited: Borger, Nestle Textkritik).

of the Greek NT by C. Tischendorf³⁴ and other critical editions listed in BDAG at the beginning of abbreviation list 1. Only occasionally does BDAG use "t. r.", and ordinarily to note "Erasmian" readings.³⁵

In the citation of New Testament text I have omitted the brackets used in N27, since a bracketed expression in its main text does not constitute a variant reading, and its presence in citation of text would clutter the lexicon beyond the breaking point of users' tolerance. In some instances the retention of brackets could even be misleading. Thus in Mark 10:7 καὶ . . . αὐτοῦ appears in brackets, creating the impression that there is some real merit in its omission by Vaticanus, but this typographical signal here relates to the Westcott-Hort tradition of according precedence to Vaticanus. The correct rendition, as R. Borger notes,³⁶ is found in Matthew 19:5 and its omission in B at Mark 10:7 lacks all merit. Similarly, the bracketing of Mt 12:47 puts into question the narrative integrity of Matthew's recital. The use of brackets in the text of 1 Cor 10:20 is an instance of overkill, for the genuineness of the second θύωσιν is not seriously questioned. In short, the omission of brackets in lexical citation of N27 eliminates not only profusion of confusing punctuation, but also needless critical confrontation.

Numerous entries contain variant readings not found in BAAR. Under πολὺς BDAG takes account of the variant πολλῶ in Mt 10:31 and Lk 12:7. This variant appears in the apparatus of N25 and Aland's *Synopsis*, but

34. Constantin von Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece, editio octava critica maior*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Giesecke and Devrient, 1869; 1872). Also, H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*, 4 vols. (Glaue: Berlin 1902-13). Variants in the Gospels can be readily located in K. Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, 13 rev. ed., 3d printing (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1988).

35. For Erasmian readings see, e.g., ἀκαθάρτης, an otherwise non-existent word alleged for Rev. 17:4; ἀναζάω 20:5; διαδίδωμι 17:13; διαφάνης 21:21; δύνατος 6:15; ὁρθρινός 22:16; Ἐφέσινος 2:1, but only the term entered with a directive: "s. Ἐφεσος"; ῥυπώω Rv 22:11; συμμαρτυρέω 22:18; φάσκω 2:2; θαμβέω and τρέμω Acts 9:6. Many readings in the textus receptus tradition can be found in *The Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text*, ed. by Z. C. Hodges and A. L. Farstad (Nashville: Nelson, 1982). On the role of Desiderius Erasmus and the Elzevir relatives, Bonaventure and Abraham, in the popularization of the term "Textus Receptus," see B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 3d enlarged ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) 98-106 and 283, n. 5.

36. Borger, *Nestle Textkritik*, 28.

not in N26,27. Given the reading πολλῶ στρουθίων, one would render: "You are worth far more than sparrows." The use in Luke 8:51 of the word συνεισέρχομαι by Sinaiticus lays high claim to priority, and the socio-anthropological implications in the preferential treatment given to the briefer compound εισέρχομαι deserve further discussion.³⁷ Scholarly discussion of the problem has been retarded because of misinformation in N26, which carried the reading συνελθεῖν for the passage. The matter is corrected in N27, and BDAG cites the data. In Luke 10:38 the phrase εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν is allotted to the apparatus in N27, but a strong argument can be made for its originality.³⁸ Especially significant lexically is the alert given s.v. πόρνος in BDAG, to the effect that in Rev 17:5 males may be signified. In BAAR no reference is made to the problem of a homograph in the textual tradition preceding use of accented forms. Moreover, the apparatus of N27 is not generous with information. A student wishing to know the probabilities for an accurate assessment of textual reality in Rev. 17:5 must therefore press beyond the rubric in N25: "2053 al.; Griesbach." In fact, the evidence for the reading πόρνων piles up incrementally once the technical literature is explored, especially in the texts of Tischendorf and von Soden. In short neither lexicographers nor those who quote them dare assume the validity of all accentuation in critical texts, not even in lexicons.

At Ἀντιπῶς BAAR cites Rev 2:13, but ignores the lexical problems associated with this term, a deficiency that looms large in the failure of N26 and 27 to include in the textual-critical apparatus information available in other editions of the Greek NT.

The pronoun αὐτός can take one on hazardous slopes, as witness the use in Mk 6:22=Mt 14:6. Resolution of problems raised by the text is lexically imperative, for the familial identity of Salome, whose name we derive from Josephus (Ant. 18, 5, 4), is here at issue. The only reasonable rendering of the Greek text in Mk 6:22 (N27), without indulgence in translation calisthenics, is: "When his (Herod's) daughter, Herodias, came in and danced, she pleased Herod and his guests." But this sets history on its head, without apology to Mark, who is now alleged to make Herod the father of the dancer and ascribe to her the name of her

37. See Borger, Nestle Textkritik, 31-32

38. BDAG s.v. oijkiva 1a.

mother.³⁹ A lexicon ought not be the administrator of discredited textual theory, including that of the alleged superiority of the Westcott-Hort approach with its benign confidence in the marriage of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, whose impress is left on the Nestle tradition of Mk 6:22.⁴⁰

Whether conjectures deserve a position in the main text of a critical edition is debatable, but if they are given such position the fact ought to be clearly indicated in the apparatus. It is fortunate that the Alands clarified matters in connection with the unusual resort to brackets for a conjectural reading in Acts 16:12, where the sigma affixed to πρώτη is credited in N27 to Johannes Clericus, thus clearing up problems raised by the convoluted citation of evidence in N26.⁴¹ Both BAAR and BDAG provide information on the textual and historical problems connected with Luke's reference to the importance of Philippi.

One of the principal causes of lexicographical or textual critical howlers is the mesmerizing power of misprints. Who can count the number of pairs of eyes that looked upon ἡ πίναξ from the time of Preuschen's lexicon and on through Bauer's texts (German and English, except for later printings of BAGD), with industrious fidelity in the Alands' version of Bauer? But none is quite so embarrassing to scholars as the misprint in Tischendorf's transcription of evidence for the reading πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς as variant for πρὸς αὐτοῦς in Mk 9:16. In effect Tischendorf's page gave a different list of manuscripts for one and the same word: αὐτοῦς. The evidence appeared overwhelming, and Westcott and Hort were thoroughly impressed, followed, of course, by the editors of Nestle through the 25th edition because of the prestige of Vaticanus. To judge from N26 and 27 there is no textual problem, but Aland's *Synopsis*, sets forth evidence for clear writing by Mark, as registered in a long array of geographically and temporally separated witnesses. BDAG tells the story succinctly under ἑαυτοῦ.⁴² The same practice is followed in connection with conjectures

39. See Frederick H. A. Scrivener, *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 4th ed. by E. Miller, 2 vols. (Bell:London, 1894), II, 303; for genealogical data, see Justin Martyr, cited in Aland, *Synopsis*, no. 144, lines 48-52, where Salome is called Herod's "daughter-in-law."

40. Borger, *Nestle Textkritik*, 25-27.

41. It is easy to be caught in the trap and conclude that Vaticanus supports the reading πρώτη τῆς μερίδος. On the movement of the conjectured identity from S. Crell to Nigel Turner to J. Clericus in the Nestle tradition, see Borger 36-38.

42. See also Borger, *Textkritik*, 27-28.

and even mistaken readings or transcription errors, especially involving papyri. The reference under πρόδρομος in Bauer's editions, as well as BAG and BAGD, to an inscription from Delos proves to be invalid, for it contains a transcription error, πρόδρομος for the architectural term πρόδρομος. The reference is therefore omitted in BDAG.

As noted above, Preuschen introduced students to the importance of the Apostolic Fathers for NT study. Every effort has been made to maintain this emphasis in the Bauer tradition through inclusion of all the vocabulary found in Bihlmeyer's edition. Also, there appears much of the vocabulary used in other early Christian literature, as identified in BDAG abbreviation list 1.

Completeness of citation troubled Bauer in the first stages of his work. In later editions he used a single asterisk to indicate citation of all references in the literature that served as data-base for the lexicon. A double asterisk at the end of an entry indicated that completeness applied only to the NT. My work on BAGD indicated that many of the inherited asterisks were invalid. The Rev. Mr. J. Recks repaired some of the damage by tracking down omitted references to the NT.⁴³ But during work on BDAG it became apparent that I could not rely on the use of asterisks in BAAR. Since the services of a Recks were not available, I scuttled them. The entire matter awaits resolution in a succeeding stage, for it requires labor-intensive analysis at the hand of electronic texts of BDAG and all the literature that serves as its data base, with due attention to variant readings.

In the organization of entries, BDAG generally supplies Bauer's philological/historical information immediately following the headword. Depending on the type of headword, grammatical data, especially relating to verbs, come first. Then a succession of non-NT writers and writings containing the headword. These are principally represented in one or more of the following categories: ancient authors, inscriptions, papyri, LXX, intertestamental literature, Philo, Josephus, and early Christian writers, especially apologists. A number of headwords are such standard fare, that detailed listing would have been a case of transporting owls to Athens. The entries therefore contain a plus mark (+) after the primary representative to indicate that inscriptions, papyri, LXX, intertestamental writ-

43. F. W. Danker, *Multipurpose Tools for Bible Study* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, rev. ed. 1993), 7.

ings, Philo, and Josephus contain some form of the headword. In some entries special aspects of a headword elicit additional specific references in the initial series. Hence, if all categories are represented, a plus mark will follow the reference to the first category, ancient authors.

Within an entry, references to secondary literature relating to a specific biblical reference or interpretation are cited in immediate proximity. Secondary works relating in a general way to a given meaning are cited, after a dash, at the end of the relevant division. A similar procedure is followed near the very end of many entries to indicate literature relating in general to the headword. A dash also precedes citation of one or more general works: B.,⁴⁴ DELG,⁴⁵ M-M,⁴⁶ EDNT,⁴⁷ TW,⁴⁸ and a few others. Through all these modes of reference readers have a choice for further exploration of issues or problems relating to use of the headword.

In a review of Preuschen's work,⁴⁹ Deissmann questioned the value of using throughout the lexicon series of translation equivalents or glosses, ordinarily consisting of one word, as substitutes for definitions. Johannes Louw and Eugene Nida were the first NT lexicographers to accept Deissmann's challenge in a thorough-going manner.⁵⁰ In keeping with this advance, one of the important innovations in BDAG is the use

44. C. D. Buck, *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949).

45. P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*, 4 vols. (Paris: Klincksieck, 1968-80).

46. BDAG cites the one-volume edition of J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930, reprinted 1952). The revision of M-M will include more detailed listing of inscriptions and papyri; for description of the proposed format, see G. H. R. Horsley and J. A. L. Lee, "A Lexicon of the New Testament with Documentary Parallels: Some Interim Entries, 1," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 10 (1997) 55-83.

47. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. H. Balz and H. Schneider, translated by V. P. Howard, J. W. Thompson, J. W. Medendorp, and D. W. Stott, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990-93).

48. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 10 vols. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932-79; English tr. by G. Bromiley, 9 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-74), index vol. R. Pitkin (1976).

49. A. Deissmann, in *Theologische Rundschau* 15 (1912), 356-364, esp. p. 357.

50. J. P. Louw and E. A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains*, 2 vols. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988); on their work and critique of Bauer/BAGD, s. Horsley and Lee (note 46 above) 60-66. T. Muraoka adopted the method of definition-centered approach in *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Twelve Prophets* (Louvain: Peeters, 1993); see p. xi, n. 16, for his comments on the traditional alphabetical arrangement.

of boldface roman to distinguish meanings as well as functions of head-words from translation equivalents or glosses, which appear in boldface italics.⁵¹ The terms in boldface italics for the most part suggest aspects of meaning registered in boldface roman. Obviously, the matter in boldface roman is not designed to be used as a translation equivalent. When a gloss can function as a definition, roman boldface is not used. For example, under μισθωτός there is no boldface roman, since the gloss "hired man" serves as a minimal definition by drawing on linguistic convention in the receptor language. Such a gloss is frequently followed by referential specification as: "of hired fishers Mk 1:20. Of hired shepherds J 10:12f." The clarifying formula 'of so-and-so' also frequently serves to express agency, as under μισθώτης "rewarder, lit. 'one who pays wages' of God"; that is, God is the agent for payment.

The treatment of a conjunction such as γάρ illustrates the difference between meaning in the usual sense and description of function. The entry contains three major divisions: "**1. marker of cause or reason, for . . . 2. marker of clarification, for, you see. . . 3. marker of inference, certainly, by all means, so, then. . .**" Boldface roman as used here highlights the sort of description that appears in plain typeface in earlier editions. Each description of this function word serves as a definition in the sense of a boundary marker, and is followed by various terms, which English, as receptor language, offers as conventional signifiers within the specific semantic boundary indicated by boldface roman. Thus the roman boldface in this and other entries opens the door to the reader's own innovative translation, with glosses in italics serving as guides. Readers whose native language is other than English need not first take a detour and search a bilingual dictionary for definitions of a string of English glosses, but can draw on the competence of their own language for a term or phrase that does justice to the boldface definition.

Users of earlier editions complained about difficulty in ready identification of New Testament references on a sea of plain typeface. They are now assured of more pleasant sightseeing through extension of bold typeface to such references. But references to passages that receive incidental mention, as in a bibliographic reference, do not appear in boldface.

51. Cp. the "detours" made by Horsley/Lee in the direction of definition-centered approach in their ongoing revision of Moulton-Milligan, s. their article (cited in note 46), esp. pp. 59-61.

Frequently reorganization of Bauer's material proved necessary in order to give priority to lexical interest. For example, in Bauer/BAAR $\mu\text{-}\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ introduces three grammatical classifications with the glosses "has-sen, mit Hass verfolgen, verabscheuen" (BAGD: "hate, persecute in hatred, detest, abhor."). This amounts to totality transfer. BDAG allots passages under two definitions, each followed by glosses: "1. to have a strong aversion to, *hate, detest* . . . 2. to be disinclined to, *disfavor, disregard* in contrast to preferential treatment. . . ." The introductory paragraph to these divisions includes the observation: "The English term 'hate' generally suggests affective connotations that do not always do justice especially to some Semitic shame-honor oriented use of $\mu\text{-}\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$."

The word "klassisch" was frequently used by Bauer in contrast to literary products in the so-called Hellenistic period. Unfortunately, the term lacks scientific precision and is a source of hazard. Many students, for example, think that L-S-J-M⁵² is a lexicon of "classical Greek" because it is frequently so termed in bibliographies, but its coverage of Greek literature actually extends to 600 AD. In a survey of ancient Greek literature, H. J. Rose,⁵³ divided productions demographically: pre-Hellenistic and Hellenistic, without discussion of the problem of "Hellenistic" linguistic ingredients in earlier so-called "classical" literature. In *Atlas of the Classical World*,⁵⁴ the editors devote 28 pages to "The Classical Period" and 24 to "Hellenism," and the rest to Rome. To resolve the problem BDAG adds to strings of ancient usage the names of one or more authors universally connected, after Homer, with the finest literary productions of Greece, such as those of Plato, Thucydides, Herodotus, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. Often BDAG also fills out Bauer's mere category "klassisch" with references to texts of specific authors.

Negative criticism has been voiced concerning Bauer's lists of publications, especially since many of the works are in German. I must confess that I thought of brandishing a ruthless ax. The very thought subjects one to unthinkable hazard. It is scarcely a mark of scholarly responsibility to excise what one has not first examined in detail for the light that

52. See note 16.

53. H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Literature from Homer to the Age of Lucian*, 4th ed. rev., reprinted with corrections (London: Methuen, 1956).

54. A. A. M. van Heyden and Howard H. Scullard, *Atlas of the Classical World* (New York: Nelson, 1959).

Bauer must have determined a certain scholar might shed on matters discussed in a given entry. Besides, it is poor manners to misapply Matthew 20:1-16 and profit from the gains of those who toiled in an earlier time, only unceremoniously to cut them off from memory. *Mortui etiam sentiunt*. Swathe-cutters are honor-bound first to examine carefully all such bibliographical entries and excise primarily that which merely repeats previous discussions or has been totally superseded. If, indeed, much of the secondary literature cited by Bauer and deemed otiose were noted in commentaries, that would be an achievement warmly to be greeted, but such is not the case. At one point I was about to chop out a clump of twenty or more titles, but could not find one depository that took account of more than a third. So much for commentary back-up! Indeed, I have discovered that many commentaries lack some of the principal resources for basic information, and few contribute much to the resolution of such problems as were presented above in connection with variant readings. Whereas Bauer's information ought to be a starting point for serious investigation, many of his references frequently are not checked for their contributions, and in some instances hasty conclusions are drawn about the manner of his presentation. So, for example, a reference to an ancient non-biblical author might be viewed as deficient in pertinence, whereas closer examination would reveal that Bauer at the moment was focusing on grammatical similarity rather than topical analogy. Moreover, precipitate deletion can prove embarrassing. For example, BAAR advises readers s.v. Φαρισαῖος to check for literature under Σαδδουκαῖος, but there, alas, Bauer's very helpful bibliography is no more. Likewise, Bauer stored some interesting reading material at μάργος, and steered his readers to it via ἄσθήρ. In BAAR the directive leads readers to mourn the fate of Sisyphus.

A further consideration relating to the generous citation of secondary literature is the fact that a given user of the lexicon may be able to locate at least something for further study, given varying personal or institutional bibliographic resources. In general, the abundant secondary literature provides the reader with a buffer against "private interpretations" and offers protective ointment against the disease of thinking that knowledge begins with the current generation. Incidentally, the editors of BAAR excused their excision of bibliographic data as a space-saver for additional lexical information, apparently without awareness that their

printed production would contain about 11 pages of white space spread over the ends of letter entries. This space could have accommodated more than 2000 titles. BDAG includes most of Bauer's data, without sacrifice of any space for other items.

Failure to recognize the value of some relatively old works can lead to the hazard of philological deprivation or worse. In a grammar written in 1655, Georg Pasor observes that the inclusion of the term God as maximizing qualifier is a Semitic idiom used in Jonah 3:3 and appears, e.g., in Acts 7:20 and 2 Cor 10:4.⁵⁵ Translators of the last passage struggle to get it right with such renderings as "divinely strong" (Moffatt); "divine power" (NRSV); "divinely potent" (NEB). The very same versions are on target for Jonah 3:3, bellwether for the idiom: Nineveh is "a great, great city" (Moffatt); "a vast city"; an "exceedingly large city" (NRSV).⁵⁶ An ironic reversal of the idiom appears in the story of the Tower of Babel: God cannot make it out from a celestial position, Gen. 11:5.⁵⁷ The Twentieth Century New Testament well grasps the point in Act 7:20: Moses was a "wonderfully beautiful child," but the New American Bible (revised NT 1986) does better at 2 Cor 10:4: weapons "enormously powerful." Perhaps of similar order is the expression $\kappa\iota\theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (Rev 15:2)="great harps," for the melody they sound must have sonority appropriate to the occasion.⁵⁸

Pasor's contribution points to other hazards in semantic transference from one language to another. The simplest problem I encountered had to do with weights and measures and monetary equation. Since BDAG was to reach an international market, in most cases I used the metric system and endeavored to avoid modern monetary equations, since ignorance of ancient market circumstances and modern fluctuations in value of silver and gold inevitably lead to falsification. For example, I did not

55. H. Schlosser, "Die erste Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch und das erste Septuaginta-Wörterbuch," in *Neutestamentliche Studien, Georg Heinrici zu seinem 70. Geburtstag* (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1914), with additional references (p. 256) noted by Pasor; cp. BDAG s.v. ὀστειός and θεός.

56. Hans Walter Wolff, *Jonah: Church in Revolt* (St. Louis: Clayton, 1978), p. 47, captures the idiom in his literal rendering of Jonah 3:3: "Nineveh was a large city even for God himself." He goes on to explain: "For a Palestinian in Jonah's time, this would have been a city of absolutely fantastic proportions."

57. Unless the focus in Gen 11:5 is on a judgment in the offing.

58. On the Greek words cp. the entries in the German and American editions, in the latter (BAGD and BDAG) without recognition of Pasor: mea culpa, but now with penance.

know what to make of the fact that in Bauer's 2d ed. (1928) the Attic $\mu\nu\tilde{\alpha}$ is pegged at "100 Goldfrancs," but in the 5th ed. (1958) at "80 Goldmarks": the Goldmark evidently held its own, for in 1988 BAAR also read "80." At my effort to secure advice German colleagues simply shook their heads. It was not possible in BDAG to direct the reader to commentaries, for few contain the details necessary to evaluate monetary references. What it takes is the knowledge, for example, of how many *lepta* a beer cost in Nazareth in both 30 and 80 AD. But those who think that this lexicographer has left the reader of BDAG totally in the dark concerning these matters are advised to read what is said there under $\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu$. As for $\delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\acute{\eta}$, the economic information under that word is vital for understanding the semiotics of the story in which the term occurs.⁵⁹ Although BDAG is scarcely a homiletics textbook, it is just possible that some of the information under such headwords may awaken someone on a Sunday out of fantasizing about the outcome of the afternoon's sporting event.

Hazard of another kind attends the use of contemporary socio-cultural analogies to explain ancient phenomena. I thought I was rendering a service by noting under a first draft of $\delta\epsilon\sigma\mu\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ that ancient penal detention was not for rehabilitation "as in our penal system." A major change in American policies took place *in medias res* and the simile required deletion at proof stage. But, how many pieces of obsolescent comment will remain to embarrass their perpetrator? This is a standing invitation to linguistic ferrets.

A different type of hazard developed in the first stages of preparation of BAGD. The first edition (BAG) included parallel citation of capitulation and versification in translations of the OT. But references especially to the Psalms and Jeremiah in English translations proved to be such an unwieldy, and frequently inaccurate, intrusion in citation of the LXX, that Gingrich and I opted for their omission in BAGD, and the same practice is followed in BDAG. Novices will not be unduly shortchanged, and in many instances will be spared frustration in view of the substantive differences between a modern translation of the Hebrew text and the LXX. Besides, if one may digress, it is well to hear the question addressed to a class by the eminent biblical critic and Hebraist Ferdinand Hitzig, "Have

59. Luke 15:8-9: sinners are evaluated at a relatively high price (cp. 12:7).

you a Septuagint?" One also does well to stay for Hitzig's own answer: "If not, sell all you have, and buy one." In any event, the outer margin of N27 follows standard divisions, unless otherwise specified with a Gothic G, and most translations direct readers to OT sources in familiar chapter and verse divisions.

One of the more difficult semantic problems dealt with the dichotomy of literal (=usual) and figurative meaning. Endowed with thought processes ingrained since the Enlightenment, it is difficult for Western Europeans and their American counterparts to come to grips with Greek and Hebrew documents that blossom with imagery to such extent that many portions of text seem to be a kind of prosy blank verse. Indeed, I find it easier to understand such writings when I eliminate the punctuation and go along with the flow of blotches of verbal paint that ultimately end in a syntactical miracle. An indication of the dilemma is the fact that we must resort at times to 'non-literal,' suggesting a sort of sneaky intrusion of the world of the imagination into our prosaic experience. Bauer endeavored to resolve the problem in certain entries by the contrasting use of "bildlich" (as an alternative for "übertragen") and "uneigentlich," but the results only further point to the complexity of the problem. In the entry *πανοπλία* he interpreted the use of the noun in Eph 6:11,13 as an instance of "Metapher" and in a parenthetical set of data stated: "übertr. Gebr. v. *πανοπλία* auch Wsh. 5, 17 . . ." But he interprets the use of the verb *περιζώννυμι* in Eph 6:14 as "bildl." Yet, since the noun and the verb relate to military practice, both object and action are of the same order and therefore similarly imagistically expressed. In Paul's 'mythos' the imagery comes through so forcefully that the term "bildlich" is quite applicable to all the military terms in this particular chapter and the English equivalent 'imagistically' or 'pictorially' does justice to the data, while permitting reservation of the term 'figurative' for less pictorial emphasis. Everything recited in a transferred sense is in some way metaphorical, but some transferred matters are more visually oriented than others because of extended context. The rhetorical contrast is something like that of realist and minimalist in art. And when linguistic imagery reaches its pedestrian point, we speak of dead metaphors, with the nadir reached when we begin to look for new ways to speak philosophically and dig up the linguistic graveyard. In any event, I have found much profit in an old book that is not mentioned —

not even by Paul Ricoeur⁶⁰ —in recent books on semantic theory: Werner Straub, *Die Bildersprache des Apostels Paulus* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1937). Straub's chief point is what Ricoeur establishes, that a metaphor is a snapshot of a piece in a larger picture. The latter metaphor is mine.

I kept Ricoeur and Straub in mind when I reexamined the use of ὑποκρίτης and cognates and pondered whether translations of the term might not be blotting out a dominant feature in the source text by intruding an extended sense into the ancient texts. Numerous semantic problems began to emerge. Traditionally, commentators and most translations treat the terms as dead metaphors. But this tack could be a temptation to seek ease in the suburbs of philological Zion. On the other hand, what happens if one awakens out of dogmatic philologico-lexical slumber and thinks in terms of extended imagistic-pictorial rhetoric? In dialogue attributed to Jesus (Mt 6:2-4, 5-6, and 16-18) we can observe a rhetorical frame enclosing the words in each of the sections of text. Our focus is no longer on the single word, which heretofore we rendered "hypocrite" and without realizing that we were bringing to bear on the text a lexicalization from our own history of usage that may be quite foreign to the term in its context. Instead, the highlights of the original picture begin to emerge out from under an overlay of linguistic ideology. We see dramatic players looking for plaudits from admiring crowds. We see actors masking their true identities as they assume their parts. The metaphorical term is no longer dead, and therefore BDAG defines as follows: "in our literature only metaphorically actor, in the sense pretender, dissembler." After the reference to Mt 6:2, 5, 16, BDAG includes this parenthetical note: "in these three passages the dramatic aspect 'play-actor' is strongly felt." In other words, a negative affective component in a transliterated term is erased by use of a word that is at home in English and at the same time has the polysemous advantage of the Greek term, enriched by contextual scenery. Jesus emerges out of the text as a warm-hearted, but tell-it-like-it-is communicator, who, with a keen sense of humor invites his addressees to laugh at themselves and do something utterly foreign to actors who thrive on recognition. Bountiful applause awaits them from their Heavenly Father. Who can refuse a summons like that, Matthew asks between the lines.

60. P. Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor*, tr. by R. Czerny et al. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977).

The practice of literary and especially rhetorical criticism calls for a large gift of lexical perdurance if one is to avoid injustice to the text. At Mt 16:23 Jesus puts Peter in the same category with Satan. Obviously Peter is not ontologically Satan, but he is charged with functioning in the adversarial mode of Satan. This is an imagistic use of the term for Satan, which is part of a narrative framework that imparts its signifying value. The semantic point is often missed in connection with a parallel statement in J 8:44, where Jesus charges certain Judeans with having the devil as their parent. The Jesus of this text is no more anti-Judean than anti-Peter. The focus in both passages is on the functional adversarial component highlighted in the story. Such awareness of componential narrative factors, or simply contextual components, is also helpful in connection with the definition of a phrase like ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, which, when rendered with functional equivalence, equals "I will give my spirit out in abundance" (Acts 2:18).⁶¹ This particular rendering does indeed merit a place in a lexicon, but the latter ought also make provision for the dramatic imagery to emerge unobscured. This takes place when the lexicographer calls attention to the fact that the cultic rite and the gift of the spirit are intimately associated in the passage, thereby indicating that the gesture of pouring is lexically important and that the poetic aspect of the verbiage is not to be drowned. Thus lexicographers have additional responsibility to protect the poetic power of a word within a phrase from obliteration by bland prose. In general, one ought to follow the linguistic law requiring awareness of implied cultural signification. A case in point is the meaning of δικαιοκρισία. Here BAGD rendered "righteous judgment" for its use in Romans 2:5. Unfortunately, in English the term "righteous" is too multivalent to express the semantic specificity in St. Paul's text, where the auxiliary phrase "according to each one's performance" serves to sharpen the meaning of δικαιοκρισία in the direction of "just/fair verdict." The cognate δίκαιος similarly challenges the lexicographer to explain how this term, so at home in Hellenic culture, could be meaningful to non-Semitic publics when loaded with the semantic freight of Semitic tradition. It remains for commentators to fill in the details of Paul's socio-political awareness implicitly expressed in a specific text, thus raising interpretive possibility in this instance to a high level of probability.

61. So Louw and Nida (see note 50) 1, 599.

Because an expression may be either semantically designative or associative (connotative) it is particularly important that terms used to translate a given expression do not have an associative aspect which may distort the meaning of a term in the source language. The frequent use of “preach” for the term κηρύσσω is a case in point. In English, “preach” suggests a moralistic or didactic mode of communication, whereas “proclaim” may be what a NT writer expresses with the word κηρύσσω, especially when focusing on the distinctive and unique character of a message that comes with divine authority. Thus the very locale, as cited in Mt 10:27 (Lk 12:3) and other passages, calls for the rendering “proclaim.” But “preach” is appropriate in Ac 15:21 (although in the sense “advance the cause of” Moses) and in Ro 2:21.

Unlike a translation designed for public reading or for a particular kind of public, a lexicon also ought not be party to ideological distortion. Liturgical committees frequently bowdlerize otherwise clearly defined areas of scriptural text, for, it must be granted, some contain “hard sayings” or statements that some members may find too unpalatable, such as the more brutal imagery of some of the Psalms or the very earnest critique of the community by Jesus. To verify such anxiety, one need only examine the verses omitted from certain pericopes in denominational listings of readings. But this kind of elective liturgical surgery involves excision and does not really concern one lexically, whereas lexical sanitizing or refurbishing of a text out of theological, emotional, or other considerations ought to be resisted. Patriarchal terminology, to cite but one category, must be documented at face value. Conversely, it behooves the lexicographer to draw on the rich resources of the English language to avoid imposing an objectionable connotation on a text, when such connotation is not integral to the text. The term ἄνθρωπος in some contexts certainly means a specific person who happens to be male. But frequently the sense is “people,” and especially in the plural. Sexism can enter through various doors. In BAGD Συντύχη is “a Christian woman in Philippi,” but Ἐπαφρᾶς is a “Christian of Colossae.” In view of the feminine article for Συντύχη, “woman” is redundant. Almost furtive in its unobtrusiveness is the use of first names in BAG/BAGD for female scholars, and only initials for their male colleagues. Other sensitivity issues raised by such terms as ἀδελφός, διάκονος, and Ἰουδαῖος, are discussed in the foreword of BDAG.

Occasionally, a lexicographer's conclusions may draw on evidence that is no evidence and thereby heighten the level of distortion. In his 4th and 5th editions Bauer questioned whether, from a purely lexical perspective, Ἰουνιᾶς (Ro 16:7) is a woman's name. He concluded that such a view "ist durch den Zusammenhang wohl ausgeschlossen." Here he poses probability against possibility. But does his alleged proof exist? For support Bauer cites in a parenthetical note Lietzmann's commentary on Romans, in the series "Handbuch zum Neuen Testament." Yet Lietzmann offers only this: "Ἰουνίαν muss wegen der folgenden Aussagen einen Mann bezeichnen, also Ἰουνιᾶς = Junianus," followed by discussion of J. as a slave name.⁶² How the alleged "Aussagen" rule in favor of Lietzmann's conclusion is not stated. In any event, BAG saluted Lietzmann; but BAGD tipped the scales a bit in Junia's favor with cautious phrasing: "The possibility, from a purely lexical point of view, that this is a woman's name . . . deserves consideration (but s. Ltzmn., Hdb. ad loc.)." This alteration was too polite a concession to Lietzmann. Therefore BDAG reads in part: "Early patristic identification . . . favors the reading of her name in the text . . . ; in opposition to this identification Ltzmn. (Hdb. ad loc.), who offers no evidence to support his statement that the context appears to exclude her from consideration."

Associated with the foregoing concerns is the common practice of lexicographers to convey what can be termed a "stained glass" connotation to certain words, with the result that numerous texts take on a patina of exclusiveness not really present in the text. Thereby certain terms lose almost all connection with the socio-cultural context which made them meaningful for their primary audiences.⁶³ Thus the rendering "grace" for χάρις is not especially meaningful to modern audiences, whereas the ancient word χάρις was used at numerous levels or registrations to express "generosity." "Saved through God's generosity" may not sound churchly, but it expresses the truth: not a theological preference, but a semantic reality that can steer one away from the hazard of dogmatic presuppositions. Refuge in sanctified vagueness, despite the patina of cen-

62. H. Lietzmann, *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriege an die Römer*, 4th ed. ("Handbuch zum Neuen Testament" 8; Tübingen: Mohr, 1933) 125.

63. Cp. Deissmann's emphasis on cultural context, *Licht vom Osten* 340. For application to Hebrew lexicography, cp. J. L. Palache, *Semantic Notes on the Hebrew Lexicon*, tr. and ed. by R. J. Werblowsky (London: Brill, 1959).

turies of usage, is not a lexical gesture devoutly to be greeted. Indeed, such practice may invite liability to the charge of linguistic incest.

Related to the stained glass syndrome is the bias of assumption that results from traditional repetition. Luke records that Paul landed at Μελίτη. But is it the traditional Malta, or Mijet off the Dalmatian coast, or a small island called Cephallenia? Conclusions reached by H. Warnecke in favor of Cephallenia⁶⁴ have invited vigorous debate.⁶⁵

Modern morphological intrusion constitutes another annoying and abiding hazard. Virtually ignored in lexicographic discussion is the hermeneutics of typography. A lexicographer is professionally bound to inquire for example at what point the use of upper case distorts a text by introducing an alien semantic component. The very capitalization "God" or "Spirit" suggests that the underlying Greek usage is technical and thereby may become an intrusive semantic component that predetermines the meaning of θεός and πνεῦμα. Of immediate concern is the fact that one may through such typography succeed in merely suggesting to polytheists that "our God is better than your god," while avoiding the basic semantic assignment, that lexicography is more of an art than a craft of trotting out traditional glosses. Hazards connected with use of the capitalized term "Gnosticism" in connection with NT texts are too well known to require comment. I shudder to think that I may encounter violations of my own in such matters upon reading BDAG in its printed form.

Since each language has its own types of resources for referential communication, one must not be confused by the fact that in English we frequently have many more resources available for expressing the thought of a lexeme used in context in a source language. It is especially important to be aware of this in view of the formal difference between syntactical structures in English and in Greek. The morphological peculiarities of Greek make possible a periodic structure which form a semantic tableaux, whose total meaning becomes apparent when the period is completed. The meaning of a specific lexeme in such a structure becomes clear from its surrounding semantic climate. In English we frequently require se-

64. H. Warnecke, *Die tatsächliche Romfahrt des Apostels Paulus* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1987) 145-56.

65. See B. Rapske, in *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting*, ed. D. Gill and C. Gempf ("The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting" 2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1994) 37 n. 170.

mantic designation through choice of a specific term that can be selected from a vast repertoire of vocables. But thereby we risk interfering with the generative linguistic capacity of the text. Thus, the verb αἰτέω does not have numerous meanings, despite the fact that one can render it "ask for, demand, pray, or beg," depending on the text in question. Whatever the term in another language, the meaning approximates "to ask for, with a claim on receipt of an answer." One who asks for alms is putting in a request for something that satisfies a need and with implicit socio-cultural claim on the donor, as witness the guilt trip ordinarily laid on the prospective donor. By convention we use the term "beg," and thereby we inject our societal perspectives, but when a request to God is involved we ordinarily gloss the term with "pray," apparently avoiding the suggestion that one is a beggar before God. The fact is, as Bauer points out, petitioners may direct their requests to a fellow human being or to a deity. In BDAG, therefore, the glosses in bold italics are simply "ask, ask for, demand." In brief, it is important that we do not multiply meanings based on the rich reservoir of synonyms in our own language or on associations based on elaborate theological tradition. In keeping with this principle, as noted above, BDAG has decreased the number of divisions in a number of entries. Yet, I am not oblivious to the fact that my increase of divisions in some entries may elicit outcries of inconsistency.

Because of its rich morphological reservoir Greek can be minimalist in its vocabulary compared to English. A seemingly endless variety of connotative possibilities can enrich the meaning of a lexeme, which the English language in its own way is able to color by drawing on its vast repertoire of synonyms within a specific semantic set. For example, the repeated use of καί in a Greek text does not elicit the boredom that might be hazarded by the repetition of "and" in a translation of such text. Nor is this to be interpreted along the lines: it takes a lexicographer to love it. The syntagmatic setting in Greek itself provides pleasing varieties of color in the use of καί, but the same variant must be reproduced in English by synonymous expressions. On the other hand, English translation, while striving for the elegance that convention prescribes for English utterance, frequently leaves a residue of redundancy, resulting from the necessary retention of contextual features which in the source language contribute to the defining process of such a pedestrian term as καί.

Distortion of the source text can also occur when a translator uses an

expression that loads the source text with a negative intensity derived from a receptor's term that has acquired a specialized sense. For example, the Greek verb βλαφημέω, means "to speak in a disrespectful way that demeans, denigrates, maligns." The word is thus used in Greek in reference to humans or transcendent beings, whereas in English the transliteration 'blaspheme' has acquired an exclusive association with sacral aspects, and when used in translations of the Bible obscures the cultural breadth in usage of the Greek term. Even a cursory examination of βλασφημέω, βλασφημία, and βλάσφημος in BAGD (which reproduces Bauer) exposes the problem. The verb is assigned two meanings. In relation to men it means "injure the reputation of, revile, defame." In relation to a divine being it means "blaspheme." But under the alleged second meaning Ac 19:37 is cited. Yet this passage is set in a context in which Paul is charged with talk that diminishes the reputation of Artemis (19:26-27). The Ephesian secretary of state assures the crowd that Paul has not "reviled" or "defamed our God." In brief, "blaspheme" is a technical theological term that draws on pseudo-scientific validity by virtue of its transliterated form and is imposed on texts in which the word is not used technically. The lack of clarity in Bauer extends to discussion of the cognates βλασφημία and βλάσφημος.

From what we have said above it is apparent that the concept of totality transference is much more complicated than commonly assumed. In the case of a term like βλασφημέω, a range of synonyms is possible, but this does not mean that all the meanings we bring to these terms in our receptor language are semantically present in the lexical term, and therefore exist in any and every usage of the term in the source language. Context in the source text determines what specific word in the receptor language is adequate to express what the source speaker nuanced through the syntagmatic structure which colored the lexeme. When a lexeme takes on established extended usage we are dealing not with mere nuancing, but with differentiation in meaning, clearly signaled syntagmatically. For example, the word βῆμα primarily refers to a step that one makes with forward motion (GJs 6:1). By extension, one can speak of a limited area of ground envisaged by one taking a step or in stride (Ac 7:5). This would be a second meaning. Also, one can mount up toward a position on a special structure Mt 27:19 et al., which by extension may be rendered "tribunal." These are the three meanings cited in BDAG. In Bauer/BAGD there are only two,

and, with the data submitted, correctly so. But the data as cited in BAAR required reappraisal of divisions, for BAAR adds a reference to GJs 6:1 in Bauer's first division. Failing to note that the noun "Schritt" is polysemous like βῆμα, the editors of BAAR also fell into the gloss trap and classified GJs 6:1 beside Ac 7:5, thereby retaining Bauer's two divisions, but neglecting to note that the new reference demanded an additional one devoted to Ac 7:5. In BDAG the added division reads: "**a very limited space, step** οὐδὲ β.ποδός *not even a square meter of ground*, less than the space covered by a person taking a stride Ac 7:5 ('foothold' REB; cp. Dt 2:5)."

In the case of βίος we have the opposite problem. The capacity of German for formation of compounds can lead to semantic falsification when features in the context of a specific Greek term become embedded in the receptor glossing term, without determining the specific meaning of the source term. Thus we have in Bauer/BAGD/BAAR three divisions, but 1 and 2 ought to be combined, leaving an essential difference between: "**1. life and activity associated with it, life**" and "**2: resources needed to sustain life, means of subsistence.**" For the latter such synonyms as 'property' or 'goods' present themselves.

A major feature in Bauer's editions is his dutiful subjection to the mode of self-falsification, without which alleged scientific work becomes an exercise in dogmatic or ideological rhetoric. The present work endeavors to maintain Bauer's tradition, with additional alternate viewpoints, and with tacit invitation for further scholarly exploration. Since modern lexical classification runs the hazard of putting linguistic reality into a strait-jacket designed by the receptor, frequent allowance is made for overlapping of interpretation, especially in subdivisions of definitions. Hence a reference may be repeated within the same entry.

In all that has been said above concerning pitfalls encountered in the past, no one is more aware than I that criticisms invite requital. But that is one of the major purposes in this exploration of a lexicon's evolution. By pointing out some of the hazards, I subject also my own revision of the labor of others to critique in the service of ever more accurate interpretation of the texts we cherish. At the same time, I urge all colleagues in the guild to ponder ever more earnestly the same invitation to self-falsification in their own work, while moving the work of others to a higher plateau of scholarly truth.

A word about the Y2K problem. At the very beginning of this editing

project, I suggested to the copy editor that we delete all apostrophes before publication dates antedating 1920, lest readers of our lexicon be confused in the year 2019 by such a date as '15 and ask whether 1915 or 2015 is meant. We finally decided on 1930 as the break year. By 2030 linguistic evolution will have helped produce either an interesting variety or a new species.

Given that expectation, it is necessary to take account of Deissmann's observation about traditional alphabetizing of NT vocabulary.⁶⁶ Bauer met Deissmann's other lexicographic concerns, but it remained for Louw and Nida to produce a semantic domain model as alternative to seriatim listing of lexemes.⁶⁷ Admittedly, BDAG is from such perspective an exhibition of cultural lag, and it will be the task of the next generation to determine the form of remedy.

Electronic media made the publication of BDAG possible within a little more than a decade. Application of computer technology to preparation of future lexicons awaits the doing. BDAG will be the last of its printed kind, at least as respects its format and the scope of information that it includes. Developments in linguistic theory will require modification, and bibliographic data will be curtailed to keep revisions affordable for most readers. Indeed, the speed with which new discoveries, including papyri and epigraphs, cry for scholars' attention will probably call into question the very idea of a printed NT, not to speak of OT, lexicon. Electronic software will include much of the data in such revisions and at the same offer access to more that could not be printed in an affordable medium. In what is yet to be, synonyms and antonyms will be analyzed and exhibited side by side in some form of CD. Categories of references will appear in various colors. Cognate terms will be scrutinized in parallel columns of various hues. A canon of older and newer dissertations and other specialized studies will be accessed for light shed on specific passages in the data base. The vast resources of Byzantine literature will become available through electronic programs not yet devised. Web sites will multiply and chatrooms will invite discussion of problems. Much of what is envisaged here already exists in some form. The challenge will be to define lexical coherence, while laying claim on more data and coming to grips with conflict between diachronic and synchronic interests. And there's the rub!

66. A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* 342.

67. See note 50.

APPENDIX

New words in BDAG: 220

ἀδυσβάστακτος	ἄφεδρος	ἐξαφίημι
αἶθριος	Ἀχερούσιος 40	ἐξίημι
ἀκοντίζω	ἄχθομαι	ἐπάνωθεν 80
ἀλισγέω	βιβλάριον	ἐπείγω
Ἀμάθιος 5	γαλεάγρα	ἐπιφράσσω
ἀμβλύνω	γαληνιάω	ἐργαστρα
ἀμεθύστινος	γόνιμος 45	ἐτερογνωμονέω
ἀμνάς	γραῖς	Εὐβούλα 85
ἀναζωπυρέω	δαφνιδέα	εὐδίδακτος
ἀναλαλάζω 10	δειλδομαι	εὐρετέος
ἀναναπαύστως	δεσπότης	εὐφρασία
ἀναπεττάνυμι	δευτερόω 50	εὐωχέω
ἀναπνέω	διαδοχή	ἐφιπιπτος 90
ἀναρπάζω	διανυκτέρευσις	ἐωσφόρος
ἀνασκάπτω 15	διαπειράζω	ς
ἀξιόλογος	διαπλανάω	Ἡλύσιον πεδῖον
ἄοικος	διαφαίνω 55	ἡρεμέω
ἀπαξαπλῶς	διάφαυμα	Θάμυρις 95
ἀπατηλός	διεργηγορέω	θέαμα
ἀπάτρικος 20	διελαύνω	Θεονόη
ἀπλανής	διήγημα	θεώρημα
ἀποθανυμάζω	Διόφαντος 60	θῆξις
ἀποπαύω	δοξολογία	θηριομαχίον 100
ἀπόπληκτος	δρομαῖος	θηριομάχος
ἀποπληρόω 25	δωδεκαετής	Ἰερώνυμος
ἀπόρροια	δωδεκακῶδων	ις
ἀποσμήχω	ἐγρηγορέω 65	Ἰκονιεύς
ἀπόφθεγμα	εἰσηγέομαι	Ἰουθίνη 105
ἀπρόσδεκτος	ἐκδηλόω	ἰσόχρονος
ἀράομαι	ἐκκλησιάζω	ἰσωνύχως
ἀρσενόθηλυς 30	ἐκκληξίς	ἰστός
Ἀρτεμύλλα	ἐλευθέριος 70	ἱστορία
Ἀρτέμων	ἐμβριμῶς	καθήγησις 110
ἀσελγής	ἐμπολιτεύω	καινοποιέω
ἀσκανδάλιστος	ἐναρμόνιος	καλιά
ῥισμα 35	ἐνυδρος	κάλις
ἀστόχημα	ἐνωρίστερον 75	κατανδραποδίζω
ἄτεκνία	ἐξαμηνιαῖος	καταπέμπω 115
ἀφάνεια	ἐξάμηνος	κατατρίβω

κακαταχορεύω	ὀγκόω	σκέπαρνον
κατεπιθυμέω	ὀδύνω	σκέπτομαι
κατευωχέω	ὄιμοι	σκυθραπία
κατώτατος 120	ὄνειρον 155	στρουθός 190
κειμήλιον	ὄνομαστός	σύλλημα
κέλευσις	ὄπυσις	σύλληψις
Κέστος	οὔτοσί	συμφθείρω
κεφαλοδέσμιον	παλαίω	συμφύγιον
Κλεόβιος 125	παλίουρος 160	σύνοδος, ἡ 195
κλώθω	Παπίας	σύνολος
κοιμητήριον	παραδιατριβή	συνοψίζω
κυβερνάω	παράθυρος	σφοδρός
κυνηγέω	παραπέμπω	σχηματίζω
κυνηγία 130	παραφήμι 165	σωματεῖον 200
κυνήγιον	παρεκδέχομαι	ταῦ
Λογγίνος	πενθικός	τέκνημα
Λόγγος	περιγέλως	Τερέντιος
μαῖα	περιδάκρυτος	τερπνώνω
Μανάϊμος 135	περισχίζω 170	τηρητής 205
ματρῶνα	περισφύω	τοξότης
μειδιάω	πέταλον	τραυλισμός
μειλίσσω	πολιτίς	τραχηλοκοπέω
μέλομαι	πολλαπλασιάζω	τριοπίς
μετατύτικα 140	πολλαπλάσιος 175	ὑποψία 210
μετενδύω	πολλοστός	φάνωμα
μικρῶς	πόλος	φθοριμαῖος
μονοούσιος	πραΐφεκτος	φονευτής
μυθικός	πρήθω	χηρεία
Μύρτη 145	προαίρεσις 180	χηρεύω 215
Νάβαλ	προβαδίζω	χηροσύνη
νάρκη	πρόθυρον	χιλιονταετηρίς
νεάνις	προοικονομέω	χίμαρος
νικητής	προσβαίνω	χρίσις
νυμφικός 150	προσκρούω 185	χρυσόχοος 220
Ξένων	Ῥαιφάν	

Words in BDAG but not in BAAR

ἀναζωοπυρέω	ἐμβριμῶς	Ἰσκαριώτης
ἀπόφθεγμα	ἐξεστατικῶς	ἰσόχρονος
ἀρσενόθηλος	εὐρετέος	παραπέμπω
διεγρηγορέω	εἶ	προβιβάζω

Words in BAAR not appearing in BDAG

δίγνωμος	φθίνω
----------	-------